

OFFICIAL

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

590 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040
Telephone: (650) 961-8300 Facsimile: (650) 961-8301
www.beyerlaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

July 10, 2003

Receiver: Examiner Eric B. Kiss
United States Patent and Trademark
Art Unit 2122

TEL #: 703-305-7737

FAX # : 703-746-7239

Sender: Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

Re: Application No. 09/540,576
Filing Date March 31, 2000
Docket No. SUN1P252/P4198

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 15

MESSAGE:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

7/10/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Field et al.

Attorney Docket No.: SUN1P252/P4198

Application No.: 09/540,576

Examiner: Kiss, Eric B.

Filed: March 31, 2000

Group: 2122

Title: DEBUGGER PROTOCOL GENERATOR

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 10, 2003.

Signed: _____ Agnes Spence

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Tentative Participants:

1) R. Mahboubian, 44,890
2)
3)
4)

Proposed Date of Interview: July 17, 2003

Proposed Time: 16:30(AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

Telephone Personal Video Conference

Exhibit to be Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No
If yes, provide brief description:

<u>ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED</u>					
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig., #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
1) Patentability	new claims 20-30	You et al.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) 102 rejection	1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) 112 rejection	2	Java Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) On Sale Bar/103	1-9	Java One Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7/10/03

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AGRUMENTS TO BE PRESENTED:

- 1) Features not taught by the prior art: the formal specification defining a high level debugging communication protocol for communication between the first and second virtual machines; the front-end debugger program corresponding to a platform independent programming language which provides a high level debugging interface which can be accessed by a debugger application operating on a first virtual machine; the back-end debugger program code portion implementing a virtual machine debugging interface which provides the capability to control and communicate with a second Virtual machine, the back-end debugger program code portion corresponding to a platform-specific programming language; also see claims dependent on claim 20.
- 2) Features not taught Generating a front-end debugger program portion from the formal specification based on the parsing of the formal specification; and generating a back-end debugger program portion from the formal specification based on the parsing of the formal specification.
- 3) Use of a Trademark language in claims does not render the claim indefinite per se. In this case, clearly use of Java in the context of a well-known and defined programming language is permissible. However, use of language such as a "Sun Server" may require further clarification.
- 4) a) Does the Examiner mean On sale Bar or public disclosure? please clarify
b) It seems that the Examiner is referencing Java Two material which cannot be considered prior art, please clarify
c) Where in Java one Presentation generating of a front-end and back-end programs from a formal specification is taught?
d) Why would be obvious?

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on

*Note: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01). This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 C.F.R. 1.33(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative
Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

7/10/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Field et al.

Attorney Docket No.:
SUN1P252/P4198

Application No.: 09/540,576

Examiner: Kiss, Eric B.

Filed: March 31, 2000

Group: 2122

Title: DEBUGGER PROTOCOL GENERATOR

Arnold C

#16

T.D.

07/18/03

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSIONI hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by
facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 10, 2003.Signed: Agnes Spence

Agnes Spence

Amendment C

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated April 10, 2003, please enter the following
amendment in the above-identified application.

Amendments to the claims begin on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 8 of this paper.

07/17/2003 TDADE1 00000001 500388 09540576

01 FC:1201 168.00 DA
02 FC:1202 216.00 DA